

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/799,531	TAKEUCHI, TORU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas A. Morrison	3653	

All Participants:

(1) Thomas A. Morrison.

(2) Mr. Joseph Price (Reg. No. 25,124).

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 October 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1, 4 and 14-23

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



PATRICK MACKÉY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Contacted Mr. Price (applicant's representative) to get permission to amend claims 1, 4, 15, 17, 18, 21 and 23 for consistency of claim language and to correct minor errors, as per the attached examiner's amendment. Mr. Price also requested amending claim 16 for consistency of claim language and to provide means plus function limitations. The examiner also asked for permission to cancel claims 14, 19, 20 and 22, because claims 14 and 22 were substantially identical to claims 1 and 15, respectively, and claims 19 and 20 contained similar limitations to those already set forth in independent claim 16, from which claims 19 and 20 depended. During the telephone conversation Mr. Price approved such amendments to the claims and cancelation of claims 14, 19, 20 and 22. See the attached examiner's amendment.